

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,021	06/01/2001	Tuan Nguyen	2000 P 07660 US 01	3236
7	7590 02/08/2005		EXAM	INER
Siemens Corporation			FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN	
	perty Department		ADTIBUT	DADED MUMPER
186 Wood Avenue South			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Iselin, NJ 08830			2128	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Antinu Communication		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/873,021	NGUYEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Russell Frejd	2128			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days divill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 (October 2004				
		is action is non-final.				
3)	<i>,</i> —					
-/	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,7,9-13,15-21 and 23</u> is/are per	nding in the application				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-20</u> is/are allowed.					
	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 21 and 23</u> is/are rejected.					
	-					
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
	on Papers	·				
	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)[_]	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
441	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
' ')	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Application Ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
			,			
Attachment	` ·	🗖 .				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Serial Number: 09/873,021 Page 2

In re Application of: Nguyen et al.

Examination of Application #09/873,021

1. This paper is in response to applicant's amendment received on 25-October-2004. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15-21 and 23 are pending.

Specification

2. The description of this application contains a computer program listing consisting of more than three hundred (300) lines. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.96(c), a computer program listing printout of more than three hundred lines <u>must</u> be submitted as a computer program listing appendix on compact disc conforming to the standards set forth in 37 CFR 1.96(c)(2) and must be appropriately referenced in the specification (see 37 CFR 1.77(b)(4)). Accordingly, applicant's are required to cancel the computer program listing appearing in the specification on pages 14-100, file a computer program listing appendix on compact disc in compliance with 37 CFR 1.96(c) and insert an appropriate reference to the newly added computer program listing appendix on compact disc at the beginning of the specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

- 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

 Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- **3.1** Method claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 21 and 23 are rejected for reciting a process that is not directed to the technological arts. In regard to claim 1, this claim is directed at a method for modeling an electronic components assembly system. To be statutory, the utility of an invention must be within the technological arts. *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ 280, 289-90 (CCPA, 1970).

Serial Number: 09/873,021 Page 3

In re Application of: Nguyen et al.

The definition of "technology" is the "application of science and engineering to the development of machines and procedures in order to enhance or improve human conditions, or at least to improve human efficiency in some respect." (Computer Dictionary 384 (Microsoft Press, 2d ed.1994)). The limitations recited in claim 1 contain no language suggesting that claim 1 is intended to be within the technological arts. However, please note the method steps of claim 1 recited as part of a "computer-implemented method" would be considered as directed to the technological arts.

Double Patenting Rejections

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.3218 may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Serial Number: 09/873,021 Page 4

In re Application of: Nguyen et al.

4.1 Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18 and 19 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/872,401. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention is directed to tools and methods for customer benefit modeling for purposes of electronics assembly system configurations, and the application is directed to tools and methods for assisting consultation and sales efforts relating to such systems (Field of the Invention from each application). Furthermore, the claims noted above of the present invention and the application are each directed to concepts for performing simulations within an approximately thirty minute time period, utilizing a cost of ownership measure, and representing the system at a material flow level of abstraction. For at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious that the customer benefit modeling of the present invention and the assisting consultation and sales efforts of the application are not patentably distinct in so far as the specifications of each application support the identical critical features noted above.

Allowable Claims

5. Claims 15-20 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record at this time.

Response Guidelines

7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Serial Number: 09/873,021 Page 5

In re Application of: Nguyen et al.

8. Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday

from 0530 to 1400 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere,

telephone number (571) 272-3780.

mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 220 South 20th Street, Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03, Arlington. VA., 22202.

Date: 7-February-2005

RUSSELL FREJD **PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Russell FRET